



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ruins during the poet's lifetime. Cf. O. 13. 110: *λιπαρὰ Μαραθῶν*, of a country deme, renowned only on patriotic grounds.

In view of these facts we must admit that another explanation is needed for *λιπαραὶ Ἀθῆναι*. The fact that a number of different localities are honored with the same epithet seems to point to a meaning of comparatively wide application, while the serious vicissitudes, through which Athens, Thebes, Orchomenus, and Smyrna had recently passed force us to search for a glory conferred by the enduring gift of Nature, rather than one created by the hands or brain of man. We must find, then, some natural feature of Athens, shared indeed with a wide circle of Mediterranean communities, but felt to be the special attribute of the violet-crowned city. And, finally, the feature for which we seek must be one which can readily be understood as implied in the epithet *λιπαρός*—"glossy," "shining," "brilliant." We are thus driven irresistibly to the conclusion that our poet had in mind the clear and resplendent atmosphere of Attica. Brilliant skies are characteristic of most of the countries bordering upon the eastern Mediterranean, but especially and pre-eminently of Attica, as every traveler has noticed, and as many observers, both ancient and modern, have recorded. Cf. Cic. *De fato* 4. 7; Dion Chrys. *On Royalty* 6 *ad init.*; Aristides Rhetor. *Panath.* 161; Photius *Biblioth.* 441a. 28; Wachsmuth *Stadt Athen* 93 f.; Judeich *Topographie von Athen* 47.

This meaning of *λιπαρός*, "brilliant," "resplendent," suits all the passages in Pindar where the word is used, whether with names of localities, or in other locutions. Cf. Frag. 30 (6), where Themis is conducted *Οὐλύμπου λιπαρὰν καθ' ὁδόν*, to be the primal spouse of Zeus. In short, when Pindar wrote the words *λιπαραὶ Ἀθῆναι*, he meant almost precisely what the Athenian Euripides meant, when he made his chorus (*Med.* 824 ff.) sing of the children of Erechtheus:

ἀεὶ διὰ λαμπροτάτου
βαίνοντες ἀβρῶς αἰθέρος.

EDWARD BULL CLAPP

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ARISTOPHANES *CLOUDS* 1472-74

Στ. οὐκ ἐξέληλακ' ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τοῦτ' ὥομην
διὰ τουτονὶ τὸν δῖνον. οἴμοι δειλαιοῖς
ὅτε καὶ σὲ χυτρεοῦν ὄντα θεὸν ἡγησάμην.

This passage has long defied the commentators. The difficulty is an old one as R and V have *δια* unaccented and a lesser Paris MS, *δά*, which approximates Bentley's subtle but unconvincing emendation, *τότ' ὥομην* | *Δία*. This reading of Bentley's is, however, impossible, if for

no other reason, because Strepsiades had never confused Zeus and Dinos, but merely thought the former had been supplanted by the latter (cf. 381, 828, 1471). Meineke's *τοντουί* (of Socrates) is wrong, for Socrates is not present, and involves a misuse of the preposition (see S. Sobolewski *De praepositionum usu Aristophaneo* [Moscow, 1890], p. 111). The real crux is l. 1474. No satisfactory explanation of this has been given or can be given in my opinion. That a large earthenware jar (*δῖνος*) was hanging outside the *φροντιστήριον* as a symbol of Dinos, or even an *ἀγαλμα Δίνου*—Schol. V—(under what conceivable shape?) is preposterously crude and stupid, and any such object must have been mentioned at 200 ff., where Strepsiades passes in review the visible apparatus. Van Leeuwen's stage direction—*subito domum intrat, unde elatum redit vas rotundum afferens*, or Heidhues' suggestion (*Neue Philol. Rundschau* [1898], p. 387) that the old man comes bouncing out of his house with a *δῖνος* in his hand at the very beginning of the quarrel (i. e., v. 1321, so that 150 verses would have to pass without any reference to it!), presupposes stage business far too clumsy and farfetched for Aristophanes. Besides in what conceivable sense could an earthenware *δῖνος* be the *cause* of Strepsiades' fond imagining?

The truth is, 1474 is spurious; it bears all the earmarks of a line composed to explain a difficulty in interpretation. On any understanding of the whole passage the line is a dull and pointless explanation of a stage action which must have been perfectly clear without it. Students of Greek comedy like Meineke, Droysen, Kock, Blaydes, and in our own country Humphreys, have pronounced against the line, and it has been unhesitatingly condemned by such experts in the ways and wiles of the scholiasts as Dindorf and Rutherford. Cf. especially the latter's note: "It is a modification of some note on *οἶμοι δέλαιος*, viz. *ὅτι καί σε χυτρεοῦν ὄντα ἡγησάμην θεόν*, or the like." The real meaning of the passage becomes clear when we take *δῖνον* as a bitter jest of the now thoroughly repentant Strepsiades on himself, referring thereby to the "vortex" or "whirl" going on in his own head during his talk with Socrates and his vain efforts to profit by his instruction. The poet has taken pains to emphasize the excited state of the old man throughout. Cf. 180 ff.; 319-21; especially 810, *ἀνδρὸς ἐκπεπληγμένου καὶ φανερώς ἐπληγμένου*, and 1457. The *τοντουί* is, of course, deictic as the scholiast says, the old man pointing significantly to his head. The passage might then be rendered roughly: "Nay, Whirl has not driven out Zeus, I only thought so for the nonce, because of the *whirl* in here (with a gesture), old fool that I was." It might be asking too much to give an exact parallel for a pun, but *δῖνος* is used by Hippocrates and later medical writers for dizziness (see Erotian's Gloss. s. v., and Franz's long note *ad loc.*)—quite as the Latin *vertigo*, which by the way is also applied to drunkenness, and though ordinary Greek idiom is "all knocked out," *ἐκπλήττεσθαι*, "all in a flutter,"

πείσθαι, or "all up in the air," ἐπαίρεσθαι, for intense excitement or surprise, nevertheless the connection of confused thought with a whirling motion is so natural (as in English we speak of one's head being "all in a whirl," "things going round and round," or remark of a crank or an enthusiast that he has "wheels in his head"), that no Greek audience can have failed to catch the point, especially when assisted by byplay like that here.

W. A. OLDFATHER

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

PLAUTUS' *TRINUMMUS* 675

Lysiteles is preaching to the young lover, Lesbonicus, a sermon on the disastrous effects of love upon one's good name and fame (641 ff.). He describes *Amor* in the phrases and figures conventional in the *sermo amatorius*: Love is a *ballista* (669); Love undermines stability of character, produces discontent (669-72); in short, "insanum [et] malumst in hospitium devorti ad Cupidinem" (673). He concludes his sermon with a somewhat confused figure:

675 si istuc, ut conare, facis † indicium † tuom incendes genus;
tum igitur tibi aquai erit cupido genus qui restinguas tuom,
atque si eris nactus, proinde ut corde amantes sunt cati,
ne scintillam quidem relinques genus qui congliscat tuom.

What part in this figure is played by *facis indicium* (675)? *Facere indicium* is excellent Latin, and familiar in Plautus' diction (*Aul.* 188. 671; *Capt.* 1014; *Cist.* 678; *M. G.* 306; *Most.* 745; *Rud.* 428, 429, 959). But what point can there be in a reference to a public announcement? The verse does not refer to the betrothal of Lesbonicus' sister and Lysiteles, but is simply part of a sermon on the evil effects of love as they are likely to be exemplified in Lesbonicus' excesses. Clearly, conservative modern editors (Leo, Lindsay, and others) are quite right in marking *indicium* corrupt, and Niemeyer is unsuccessful in trying to make sense of the MSS reading.

Nitzsch (*Rh. Mus.* XII [1857] 136) emended so as to read:

si istuc, ut conare, facis, incendio incendes genus.

But *genus . . . tuom* in 676 and 678 prevents the excision of *tuom* in 675 (cf. Brix-Niemeyer *Anhang* on 675). Others have attempted bolder changes (e. g., Bergk *Kl. Schr.* I. 104, 109) with even less success. Lambinus, however, proposed a simple remedy, following, as he says, "nostros libros veteres . . . in quibus scriptum est *incidium*. Quodsi nulli codices me adiuverant, tamen me ipsa ratio facile ad hanc coniecturam